arXiv:1010.0128v3 [quant-ph] 2 Mar 2012

Physical consequences of P≠NP and the DMRG-annealing conjecture

Javier Rodríguez-Laguna
ICFO-Institut de Ciencies Fotoniques, Barcelona, Spain and
Mathematics Dept., Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain

(Dated: March 2, 2012)

Computational complexity theory contains a corpus of theorems and conjectures regarding the time a Turing machine will need to solve certain types of problems as a function of the input size. Nature *need not* be a Turing machine and, thus, these theorems do not apply directly to it. But *classical simulations* of physical processes are programs running on Turing machines and, as such, are subject to them. In this work, computational complexity theory is applied to classical simulations of systems performing an adiabatic quantum computation (AQC), based on an annealed extension of the density matrix renormalization group (DMRG). We conjecture that the computational time required for those classical simulations is controlled solely by the *maximal entanglement* found during the process. Thus, lower bounds on the growth of entanglement with the system size can be provided. In some cases, quantum phase transitions can be predicted to take place in certain inhomogeneous systems. Concretely, physical conclusions are drawn from the assumption that the complexity classes **P** and **NP** differ. As a by-product, an alternative measure of entanglement is proposed which, via Chebyshev's inequality, allows to establish strict bounds on the required computational time.

PACS numbers: 05.30.Rt 03.65.Ud 89.70.Eg 03.67.Mn

I. INTRODUCTION

Global optimization is one of the most important computational problems in science and technology. But beyond its practical relevance, it is also of deep theoretical interest when viewed from the broader perspective of computational complexity theory [1, 2]. Problems are ranged into an intrincate classification by theoretical computer scientists, and an impressive corpus of theorems and conjectures has been built to relate them, such as the Cook-Levin theorem [3, 4] which proves the existence of **NP**-complete problems, or the conjecture that **P**≠**NP**.

All those complexity classes are defined with respect to an abstract computer, the *Turing machine*. Physical devices designed to solve a particular problem need not be subject to that restriction, i.e.: a **NP**-complete problem *might* be solved in polynomial time by a physical device even if **P**≠**NP**. The reason is that *Nature need not be a Turing machine*. Notwithstanding, *simulations* of physical processes on classical computers are bound by the previous hierarchy of classes, since they are (approximately) Turing machines. If **P**≠**NP**, any attempt to solve a **NP**-complete problem in polynomial time with a simulation of a physical process on a classical computer must fail. The reasons for the failure must be deducible from the simulation details, and insight about the underlying physical process might be obtained.

Quantum mechanics provides the most promising physical attempt to outperform classical computation, and among all the quantum computational techniques, we will focus on *adiabatic quantum computation* (AQC), also known as *quantum annealing* [5, 6]. The possibility of using AQC to solve **NP**-complete problems in polynomial time is one of the most exciting problems in quantum computation, but it is not addressed in this work. We will focus on *classical simulations* of AQC built upon *matrix product states* (MPS) [7]. Concretely, we will analyse a technique based on an adiabatic extension of the density matrix renormalization group (DMRG) [8, 9], published as *quantum wavefunction-annealing* (QWA) [10]. Along with it, we will put forward and discuss the *DMRG-annealing conjecture*, which states that the efficiency of the QWA simulations of AQC is controlled uniquely by the maximal entanglement found during the process.

Being a classical computational technique, DMRG-based simulations of AQC can never solve **NP**-complete problems in polynomial time, unless **P**=**NP**. Accepting **P**≠**NP** and the adiabatic DMRG-conjecture to hold we can put lower bounds on the behaviour of entanglement during AQC processes. In some cases, it allows us to predict the existence of quantum phase transitions.

Our work, thus, puts under a different light ideas that are known in the field. In 2003 Vidal showed that a quantum computation involving a fixed amount of entanglement could be efficiently simulated using a matrix product representation [7], thus showing that an exponential speed-up was only possible if the MPS bond dimension grows fast with the input size. But, assuming that the ground state (GS) of a certain hamiltonian can be described as a MPS of fixed dimension, how hard can it be to find it? In 2006, Eisert showed that this problem can be NP-complete [11]. Indeed both results are not hard to reconcile within the DMRG-annealing conjecture framework, as we will show. In 2009 Hastings proved that AQC with fixed gap in 1D would never achieve an exponential speed-up [12], based on his first rigorous proof of an area law in 1D [13]. In recent years a new field is being built, known as *hamiltonian complexity*, which considers the computational complexity of performing classical simulations of quantum systems (see [14] for a recent review).

This paper is structured as follows. In section II we review the basics of adiabatic quantum computation (AQC) (or quantum annealing) [5, 6]. Section III details the quantum wavefunction annealing technique, an adiabatic extension of DMRG, and the *DMRG-annealing conjecture* is formulated and discussed in section IV. Assuming this conjecture to hold, our main result, which is the physical implications of complexity theory, are exposed in section V. The paper closes with the conclusions and further work.

II. ADIABATIC QUANTUM COMPUTATION

Since the seminal article of R.P. Feynman in 1982 [15], physicists have had an increasing interest in the *simulability* of quantum mechanics, which has grown into the field of *hamiltonian complexity* [14]. The difficulties reside in the exponential growth of the dimension of the Hilbert space. Quantum computation was born with the idea of converting this handicap into an opportunity: perhaps clever exploitation of this exponential growth will allow us to achieve an exponential speed-up of classical algorithms, maybe to solve **NP**-complete problems in polynomial time [16]. This hope has not yet been either fulfilled or disproved, and we will not address it here.

Among the quantum computational techniques proposed, we will focus on adiabatic quantum computation (AQC) [5], studied also under the name of quantum annealing [6, 17]. AQC was proved in 2004 to be *universal* in the sense that the results of any quantum computation can be simulated in polynomial time with an AQC [18].

An AQC is implemented by a physical device which establishes an adiabatic route between two hamiltonians, H_0 and H_1, such that the ground state (GS) of H_0 is easy to obtain physically, and the GS of H_1 provides the solution to some problem. The GS of a hamiltonian is difficult to achieve experimentally when the system is subject to *ageing*, i.e.: when the low energy spectrum is complex, as it happens for most disordered systems. The adiabatic theorem ensures that, *if the process is slow enough and the gap never vanishes*, the ground state of H_1 will be obtained from that of H_0.

As a relevant example throughout this work let us consider the (classical) spin-glass problem [19]. Given a graph $\mathcal{G}$ of N spins and a set of arbitrary real coupling constants J_{ij} attached to each graph link, we define the (classical) spin-glass energy as

$$E = -\sum_{\langle i,j\rangle} J_{ij}\sigma_i\sigma_j \tag{1}$$

Where the σ_i are values in $\{-1,+1\}$ attached to each site. The (classical) spin-glass problem is to find the values for σ_i which minimize the previous energy.

If the graph is 1D, the problem is trivially in **P**. If it is 2D, a non-trivial construction found by Barahona [20] also renders the problem polynomial. For higher dimensions, or for random graphs of fixed connectivity (≥ 3), the problem is **NP**-complete [21]. Even a 3D graph composed of two flat layers is **NP**-complete [20].

The AQC strategy for the spin-glass problem sets the destination hamiltonian, H_1, to be a quantum counterpart of eq. (1), promoting the $\{-1,+1\}$ values of σ_i to spin-1/2 operators [22]:

$$H_0 = -\sum_{\langle i,j\rangle} J_{ij} S^z_i S^z_j \tag{2}$$

To obtain H_0, we add to H_1 a source of quantum fluctuations, such as a uniform transverse magnetic field: $-\Gamma\sum_i S^x_i$. Thus, Γ is the the tunable parameter which connects both hamiltonians and, as a function of it, we obtain the random Ising model in a transverse field (RITF):

$$H(\Gamma) = -\sum_{\langle i,j\rangle} J_{ij} S^z_i S^z_j - \Gamma\sum_i S^x_i \tag{3}$$

where we see that $H(\infty) = H_0$ and $H(0) = H_1$.

Let $|\Psi(\Gamma)\rangle$ denote the ground state of the previous system as a function of Γ, which is only degenerate for $\Gamma = 0$. If $\Gamma \to \infty$, the ground state is found just by making all spins point in the X-direction:

$$|\Psi(\infty)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|+\rangle + |-\rangle\right)^{\otimes n} \tag{4}$$

In this state, all classical configurations take exactly the same probability, so we may say that it is absolutely disordered. For $\Gamma \to 0^+$, on the other hand, the ground state provides the solution to the classical spin-glass problem. Thus, the AQC strategy is to take $\Gamma \to \infty$, decrease it until $\Gamma = 0$, and then read the solution. The adiabatic theorem can be applied if the process is slow enough, assuming that the gap never vanishes.

The main difficulty during an AQC experiment is to ensure adiabaticity. The probability of a jump to an excited state increases exponentially as the energy gap closes, as reflected by the Landau-Zener formula [22]. Thus, if the system undergoes a quantum phase transition and the energy gap vanishes, the velocity must be reduced in an appropriate way at that point, increasing the computational time.

It may be tempting to try to extract conjectures about the minimal gap along an AQC trajectory from the (classical) complexity class of the problem at hand. But these inferences are *not valid*, since the precise nature of the relation between the quantum and the classical complexity classes is not straightforward. Recent results of Altschuler and coworkers [23] cast doubts on the possibility of solving **NP**-complete problems in polynomial time using quantum computation, due to the very narrow gap distribution in disordered systems which can be deduced by Anderson's theorem. Nonetheless, other authors are more optimistic, believing that a route which avoids exponentially small gaps is feasible [24]. Those problems, which are of uttermost importance for quantum computation, will not be studied in this work.

A caveat is in order: AQC is not designed for cases in which the gap is exactly zero at some point. This imposes certain restrictions on H_0 and H_1. For example: an adiabatic calculation in which we evolve from the (classical) ferromagnetic Ising model in S^z to a (classical) spin-glass, also in S^z, is not possible. Both hamiltonians commute, the ground state becomes degenerate at several moments, and the adiabatic theorem does not apply.

III. CLASSICAL SIMULATION OF AQC: QUANTUM WAVEFUNCTION ANNEALING

In order to apply the results of computational complexity theory, we should analyse algorithms running on Turing machines, not on arbitrary physical devices. Therefore, we will study *simulations* of adiabatic quantum computation running on a classical computer.

A first simulation approach to AQC is the use of path integral Monte-Carlo methods (PIMC) [22]. This technique does not suffer from Landau-Zener level crossings, and the closing of the energy gap doest not constitute a problem. Nonetheless, if an attempt is made to solve a **NP**-complete problem using it, it is always found that, at some moment, the system undergoes *critical slowing down*. This forces long relaxation times and reduces the efficiency of the procedure. The exact amount of this reduction is not easy to quantify, due to the different complexity classes associated with probabilistic computation [25].

A different simulation procedure, quantum wavefunction annealing (QWA), is a fully deterministic classical algorithm and lends itself more easily to analysis [10]. The key feature of QWA simulation is that it computes the full wavefunction of the involved ground states. Let $H(s) = (1-s)H_0 + sH_1$, with $s \in [0,1]$. Then, the QWA procedure is:

1. Let $s = 0$ and find the GS of the initial hamiltonian $H(s) = H_0$, $|\Psi(0)\rangle$.
2. Increase the adiabatic parameter: $s \to s + \delta s$.
3. Find the GS of $H(s+\delta s)$, $|\Psi(s+\delta s)\rangle$, *using the previous ground state as a seed.*
4. If the overlap $|\langle\Psi(s+\delta s)|\Psi(s)\rangle|$ is below a given threshold, halve δs and return to 2.
5. If $s + \delta s < 1$, make $s = s + \delta s$ and return to 2.

If this computation were done in a naive way, the number of stored components would be 2^N, thus it is unfeasible. Instead, the wavefunctions may be stored as matrix product states (MPS):

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{s_1\cdots s_N} \mathrm{Tr}(A^{s_1}\cdots A^{s_N})\, |s_1,\cdots,s_N\rangle \qquad (5)$$

where the A^{s_i} are $2N$ matrices of size $m \times m$, and m is called the *bond dimension*. The total number of components in a MPS is, therefore, $2Nm^2$. Of course, m must be chosen *so that the ground state is always accurately represented*. The required value of the bond dimension m will be, therefore, of uttermost importance in order to evaluate the efficiency of the procedure.

Our technique of choice in order to determine the MPS representation of the ground state for each value of Γ is the density matrix renormalization group (DMRG) [8, 9]. The technique has several important features:

- DMRG is variational within the MPS subspace of the Hilbert space.
- DMRG allows for adaptable values of m. In QWA simulations, m must be an *open* parameter, which is chosen to be large enough to represent the state accurately at each simulation stage, to a given tolerance.
- DMRG benefits from the use of a *seed state* in order to accelerate convergence, via the so-called *wavefunction transformations* [26].

Thus, the QWA algorithm under consideration is just an annealed extension of the DMRG.

IV. THE DMRG-ANNEALING CONJECTURE

We conjecture that QWA simulations will always obtain the true optimum of the problem in linear time in the size and polynomial time in the maximal bond dimension. Of course, the maximal bond dimension will itself depend also on the system size. The statement about linear time in the system size assumes that the bond dimension is held constant. In this section we will discuss the arguments in favour of this conjecture, and its possible pitfalls.

We should stress that the bond dimension m is an adaptable parameter of the QWA computation, which will always take the minimum value that makes the representation of the wavefunction accurate up to a certain tolerance. The maximal m is defined to be the highest value found during the full computation. This value will be, in general, highly dependent on the *DMRG path*, i.e.: the ordering of the spins required for the sweeping. Obviously, it is desirable to choose a path that minimizes this maximal m. This minimization problem can be also a hard problem, as we will discuss in section V. Heuristic low-cost approaches have been attempted to find a good DMRG path, with reasonable success [27].

It is usually assumed in the DMRG literature that the bond dimension m scales as the exponential of the von

Neumann entropy of entanglement [9], $m \approx \exp(S)$. It is straightforward to show that, given a MPS of dimension m, the maximal von Neumann entanglement that can be supported is indeed $\log(m)$. But this scaling can only be proved rigorously for some mild distributions of the eigenvalues of the density matrices.

The eigenvalues of a reduced density matrix ρ constitute a discrete probability distribution, $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^{N_T}$, which we will assume to be in decreasing order. The approximation of assuming a certain bond dimension m is equivalent to retaining the first m eigenvalues p_i and neglecting the rest. Given a certain tolerance $\epsilon > 0$, we would like to find $m(\epsilon)$ to be the number of eigenvalues that must be retained so that the sum of the remaining ones is smaller than ϵ:

$$\sum_{i>m(\epsilon)} p_i < \epsilon \tag{6}$$

The von Neumann entropy of entanglement is the Shannon entropy of the eigenvalues of ρ: $S \equiv \langle -\log(p_i)\rangle$. If the eigenvalues decay exponentially, it can be proved that for all $\epsilon > 0$, $m(\epsilon) \propto \epsilon^{-1}\exp(S)$. In case of slower decays, still a polynomial relation can be found between $\exp(S)$ and m, but this is not true for generic distributions.

Instead of the von Neumann entropy, we can employ a different measure of entanglement, such as the *variance of the eigenvalue index*:

$$\sigma^2 \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{N_T} i^2 \cdot p_i - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N_T} i \cdot p_i\right)^2 \equiv \langle i^2\rangle - \langle i\rangle^2 \tag{7}$$

With this new measure of entanglement, Chebyshev's inequality directly provides the desired relation:

$$m(\epsilon) = \langle i\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\sigma \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sum_{i>m(\epsilon)} p_i < \epsilon \tag{8}$$

Therefore, whenever σ is finite, we have a rigorous bound on the bond dimension as a function of the tolerance.

At each step, the QWA tries to transform the GS at a value of s into the GS at a slightly larger value, $s + \delta s$. In order to perform this transformation, it will proceed by carrying out as many DMRG sweeps as necessary. The cost of each DMRG sweep scales linearly in N and polynomially in m. But there is still one *caveat*: the number of DMRG sweeps might scale too fast with the system size. The conjecture assumes that this will not be the case, since both states $|\Psi(s)\rangle$ and $|\Psi(s+\delta s)\rangle$ will always be close enough. The *fidelity* $|\langle\Psi(s)|\Psi(s+\delta s)\rangle|$ measures the speed of change of the wavefunction [28]. Evidently, the algorithm must proceed more slowly near the quantum phase transition.

Thus, the strongest claim within the DMRG-annealing conjecture is that the number of required sweeps will always scale polynomially with the system size. Until a proof (or a counterexample) is provided, we can only refer to the community consensus that the DMRG is surprisingly robust in this regard [29].

To summarize: there are two steps in the QWA computation which depend on a certain tolerance threshold: the DMRG tolerance (on the sum of neglected probabilities) and the annealing tolerance (on the minimal allowed value for the fidelity). The DMRG tolerance is strictly controlled by entanglement, via the bond dimension. The effects of the annealing tolerance, on the other hand, have not been explored in depth, although no surprises are expected.

Some recent works have been devoted to study the efficiency of the computation of MPS. Finding the ground state of a 1D quantum hamiltonian can be even **NP**-complete [29]. If m is kept fixed, MPS are always nicely approximable [30]. This means that it is always possible to obtain an *approximation*, within a factor $(1+\epsilon)$ of the ground state energy, polynomially both in time and in ϵ. The complexity class which conveys fact this is called *fully polynomial-time approximation scheme* (**FPTAS**) [31].

There are other algorithms to simulate a quantum computation based on the MPS representation, e.g. [7] for standard quantum computation or [32] for AQC. The latter case uses real time simulation, which may lead to a new source of loss of adiabaticity. Nonetheless, they both point to similar relations between entanglement and the efficiency of the calculation.

Since the efficiency of the procedure is controlled by entanglement, via the maximal-MPS dimension, let us review the known results regarding its behaviour. Gapped systems usually fulfill the *area law* [33, 34], which states that the von Neumann entanglement entropy between two parts of a system scales as the number of broken links among them. This result was proved rigorously in 1D by Hastings [13]. In some higher dimensional inhomogeneous and/or disordered systems it is known not to hold [35, 36]. Moving to critical points, von Neumann and Rényi entanglement entropies have proved to be very useful magnitudes in order to pinpoint quantum phase transitions (QPT) [27]. During any adiabatic process with finite N, QPT always presents a local maximum in S. It has also been conjectured that a non-analyticity of S may constitute a good indicator of a QPT [37]. The 1D case is again rather special. At criticality, S will scale with the system size. In some cases, the size-dependence of S can be found via conformal field theory (CFT) [38]. It has been shown that, for many critical 1D problems, $S(N) \approx \alpha\log(N) + \beta$. Thus, assuming that the bond dimension $m \approx \exp(S)$, it will grow polynomially with the input size.

V. PHYSICAL IMPLICATIONS OF COMPLEXITY THEORY

A. General principles

Throughout this section, we will adopt the notation that a hamiltonian belongs to a complexity class if the problem of finding its ground state belongs to that complexity class. Of course, the DMRG-annealing conjecture will be assumed to hold.

A complexity class which is simpler than **P** is **LIN**, i.e.: the class of problems that can be solved in *linear* time. Let us consider an AQC connecting two hamiltonians H_0 and H_1, such that H_0 is in **LIN** but H_1 is not. E.g., H_1 may be in **P** but with computational time scaling faster than N, perhaps only $N\log(N)$. Then, the bond dimension must *diverge* at some point during the adiabatic route. Typically, this will imply that the von Neumann entropy will diverge also. This divergence is typically the hallmark of a quantum phase transition (QPT).

The reason can be stated as follows. Let us assume that the entanglement entropy stays finite during the whole AQC procedure. Now, let us use a classical computer to run a QWA simulation of the AQC procedure, in time $T(N)$. If the maximal bond dimension saturates with N, QWA results asymptotically in a linear algorithm to obtain the ground state of H_1, against the assumption. Therefore, entanglement must grow without bound with the system size at some moment during the AQC procedure, pointing to a QPT.

In the same line, if H_0 is **P** and H_1 is **NP**-complete, and **P**≠**NP**, then any AQC connecting the two hamiltonians will find, at some moment, a state with maximal bond dimension growing faster than polynomially in N. Typically this implies that the von Neumann entropy will grow faster than logarithmically with N. This state may correspond to a QPT. Again the reason is easy to state: otherwise, the classical simulation will provide a polynomial algorithm to solve a **NP**-complete problem.

In general terms, we may say that the adiabatic connection of two hamiltonians with different complexity classes puts restrictions on the physics along the path. In order to avoid violations of the results from complexity theory, entanglement must diverge at some moment during an AQC procedure. This divergence may take place as a quantum phase transition of a certain kind. It can be regarded as a kind of *quantum censorship* to prevent hard problems from being solved easily.

This analysis is independent of whether we focus on average or worst-case complexity. Once the set of problems is characterized, and a bound on the computational time is established, it can be immediately converted into a bound for the entanglement entropy for an AQC.

A relevant point to be made is how to know whether the divergence of the maximal entanglement points to a quantum phase transition or not. In 1D it is known that at a QPT both the entanglement entropy and the bond dimension diverge [13]. In higher dimensional studies, a more careful analysis is required, since the maximal bond dimension will likely diverge along the whole AQC procedure. In any case, for any finite instance of a problem, the maximum attained by the entanglement determines the efficiency of the QWA. Therefore, if a QPT is present, even if bond dimension diverges in a full region, it is the scaling of entanglement at the QPT which establishes the running time for the simulation.

B. Concrete examples

Let us return to the spin-glass hamiltonian (3). When $\Gamma\to\infty$, the obtention of the ground state is a trivial problem, taking time $O(1)$. In 1D, the obtention of the classical spin-glass minimum energy state is obviously in **LIN**. Therefore, our results do not apply in this case, since QWA takes always time $\geq N$.

In 2D, on the other hand, a prediction can be done. Solving the 2D classical spin-glass problem is known to be in **P** [20]. Therefore, the entanglement entropy must diverge for some value of Γ. We can only state that this maximal entropy will grow, *at least*, logarithmically. In fact, recent results [36] (cleverly exploiting the properties of the infinite randomness fixed point [39], IRFP) show that it grows with a modified area law: for a block division cutting l links, the entropy scales as $s(l)\approx l\log(\log(l))$. Maximal entropy, as it is defined in this work, would be $S(N)\approx N^{1/2}\log(\log(N))$, thus rendering the time for the QWA simulation exponential. Our result is, therefore, valid but too weak.

Nonetheless, the previous expression for the block entropy in a 2D quantum spin-glass is based on the average number of clusters cut by the block division. A well designed DMRG path might never cut more than one cluster at a time, just sweeping them one by one. In that case, the maximal entropy might grow much more slowly with the system size. But, in order to obtain such a path, one should *first* solve the classical problem. Therefore, again, our basic result is not violated.

In 3D, or for random graphs of fixed connectivity, the **NP**-completeness of the problem forces the maximal entropy along the route to grow faster than $\log(N)$. In this case, the result is not surprising.

Other analysis [40] have been carried out of the entanglement entropy along typical standard quantum computations, and our general statements also hold. For example, the entropy along Grover's algorithm remains bounded, which is consistent with the fact that the problem under consideration (unsorted search) is in **LIN**. Also, an AQC designed to solve the exact cover problem (which is **NP**-complete) found a QPT with $S\approx N$. Shor's algorithm also shows a similar behaviour, although it is not clear which is the complexity class of the problem under study (i.e.: integer factorization).

New predictions are easily made for AQC designed to solve problems which have never been studied. Thus, an AQC designed to test planarity of a graph, or 2-colorability, need not find a quantum phase transition, since these problems belong to class **LIN**. But an AQC which sorts a set of numbers, or which performs the fast Fourier transform, will find a divergence in the bond dimension and, very likely, in the von Neumann entropy, since their running time is larger than linear. The maximal entropy in those cases might grow very slowly with size, since the (average) running time for the best algorithms are $T \approx N\log(N)$, so our only bound is that S should scale at least like $\log(\log(N))$. On the other hand, if $\mathbf{P}\neq\mathbf{NP}$, any AQC attempt to solve the traveling salesman problem, or 3-SAT, will always find maximal entropy growing faster than logarithmically.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Theoretical physics has benefitted continuously from the incorporation of the results of branches of pure mathematics which were born without any relation to it. Computational complexity theory is just another branch of mathematics, and this work just attempts to extract its most straightforward consequences for physics. As Nikolai Lobachevski put it: *"There is no branch of mathematics, however abstract, which may not someday be applied to the phenomena of the real world"* [41].

In this work we have put forward a strategy to derivate physical inferences from computational complexity theory. If a physical process is devised in order to solve some problem, simulating that process in a (classical) computer constitutes a (classical) algorithm to obtain the solution. The efficiency of this algorithm may be restricted by complexity theory, and this restriction must have some counterpart in the physical model which may apply to the real physical system.

Concretely, adiabatic quantum computation (AQC) may be simulated in classical computers using quantum wavefunction annealing (QWA), which is a simulation strategy based on the density matrix renormalization group (DMRG). The efficiency of QWA is conjectured to be controlled by the maximal entanglement attained during the physical process. Different measures of entanglement are discussed (bond dimension and von Neumann entropy) and a new one is introduced (variance of the eigenvalue index). Arguments are given in favour of this conjecture, along with an exposition of its possible pitfalls.

If there is a bound on the scaling of the computational time to solve the problem on a classical computer, then this bound will transform itself into another bound for the maximal entanglement attained during the real physical procedure. This type of no-go reasoning bears resemblance to the second law of thermodyamics. In this way, the divergence of entanglement with the system size for some systems is proved. This divergence, in some cases, may be viewed as the apparition of a quantum phase transition, which can be regarded as a "quantum censor", preventing the solution of hard problems in an easy way (in a classical computer).

The present derivation was performed using MPS and the DMRG, which are not specially well suited for multidimensional systems, due to the need for a 1D path to run through the system. Different generalizations of MPS exist, such as multiscale entanglement renormalization Ansatz [42] (MERA) or projected entangled pair states [43] (PEPS), which are altogether labeled as tensor product states [44] (TPS). New techniques have been developed for 2D optimization problems, making use of ideas related to *dynamic programming* [45, 46]. Also, other techniques have been proposed in order to simulate real time evolution in the Heisenberg picture [47]. We expect that application of this line of thought to these sophisticated tools will provide stronger predictions on the physics found during the performance of an adiabatic quantum computation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been supported by the Spanish government by grants FIS2009-11654, FIS2009-12964-C05-1, FIS2008-00784 (TOQATA) and ERC grant QUAGATUA. The author wants to acknowlege very useful discussions with G. Sierra, M. Lewenstein, I. Rodríguez, D. Peralta-Salas, E.H. Kim and S.N. Santalla.

---

[1] C. Papadimitriou, *Computational Complexity* (Addison Wesley, 1994).

[2] S. Aaronson, G. Kuperberg, and C. Granade, "Complexity zoo," (2010).

[3] S. A. Cook, in *Proceedings of the third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, STOC '71 (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1971) pp. 151–158.

[4] B. Trakhtenbrot, Annals of the History of Computing **6**, 384 (1984).

[5] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, S. Gutmann, J. Lapan, A. Lundgren, and D. Preda, Science **292**, 472 (2001).

[6] A. Das and B. K. Chakrabarti, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 1061 (2008).

[7] G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 147902 (2003).

[8] S. R. White, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 10345 (1993).

[9] U. Schollwock, Annals of Physics **326**, 96 (2011), january 2011 Special Issue.

[10] J. Rodríguez-Laguna, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment **2007**, P05008 (2007).

[11] J. Eisert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 260501 (2006).

[12] M.B. Hastings, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 050502 (2009).

[13] M. B. Hastings, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment **2007**, P08024 (2007).

[14] T. Osborne, "Hamiltonian complexity," (2011), arXiv:1106.5875.

[15] R. Feynman, International Journal of Theoretical Physics **21**, 467 (1982), 10.1007/BF02650179.

[16] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[17] A. Das and B. K. Chakrabarti, *Quantum Annealing and Related Optimization Methods*, Lecture Notes in Physics (Springer Verlag, 2005).

[18] D. Aharonov, W. van Dam, J. Kempe, Z. Landau, S. Lloyd, and O. Regev, in *Proceedings of the 45th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science* (2004) pp. 42–51.

[19] K. Binder and A. P. Young, Rev. Mod. Phys. **58**, 801 (1986).

[20] F. Barahona, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **15**, 3241 (1982).

[21] F. Liers, M. Palassini, A. K. Hartmann, and M. Jünger, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 094406 (2003).

[22] G. E. Santoro, R. Martoňák, E. Tosatti, and R. Car, Science **295**, 2427 (2002).

[23] B. Altshuler, H. Krovi, and J. Roland, (2009), arXiv:0912.0746v1.

[24] N. G. Dickson and M. H. S. Amin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 050502 (2011).

[25] D. A. Battaglia, G. E. Santoro, and E. Tosatti, Phys. Rev. E **71**, 066707 (2005).

[26] S. R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3633 (1996).

[27] J. Rodríguez-Laguna, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **40**, 12043 (2007).

[28] M. Cozzini, P. Giorda, and P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 014439 (2007).

[29] N. Schuch, I. Cirac, and F. Verstraete, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 250501 (2008).

[30] N. Schuch and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 012314 (2010).

[31] G. Ausiello, P. Crescenzi, G. Gambosi, V. Kann, A. Marchetti-Spaccamela, and M. Protasi, *Complexity and Approximation: Combinatorial optimization problems and their approximability properties* (Springer-Verlag, 1999).

[32] M. C. Bañuls, R. Orús, J. I. Latorre, A. Pérez, and P. Ruiz-Femenía, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 022344 (2006).

[33] M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 666 (1993).

[34] J. Eisert, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 277 (2010).

[35] A. Sen(De), U. Sen, J. Dziarmaga, A. Sanpera, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 187202 (2008).

[36] Y.-C. Lin, F. Iglói, and H. Rieger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 147202 (2007).

[37] X. Jia, A. R. Subramaniam, I. A. Gruzberg, and S. Chakravarty, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 014208 (2008).

[38] G. Vidal, J. I. Latorre, E. Rico, and A. Kitaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 227902 (2003).

[39] D. S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 6411 (1995).

[40] R. Orús and J. I. Latorre, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 052308 (2004).

[41] N. J. Rose, *Mathematical Maxims and Minims* (Rome Press Inc., 1988).

[42] G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 110501 (2008).

[43] N. Schuch, M. M. Wolf, F. Verstraete, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 140506 (2007).

[44] T. Nishino, Y. Hieida, K. Okunishi, N. Maeshima, Y. Akutsu, and A. Gendiar, Progress of Theoretical Physics **105**, 409 (2001).

[45] M. B. Hastings, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 167206 (2008).

[46] D. Aharonov, I. Arad, and S. Irani, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 012315 (2010).

[47] T. J. Osborne, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032321 (2007).